UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,696	08/04/2000	Vincent Bahl	BTI 00.01A	2707

7590 08/14/2003

Edmund P Pfleger
Hayes Soloway Hennessey Grossman & Hage PC
130 W Cushing Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

EXAMINER	
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	5

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/632,696	BAHL, VINCENT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srirama Channavajjala	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 August 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Examiner acknowledges applicant's "Remarks" filed on 8/8/2003,paper no. 4

Drawings

2. The drawings filed on 8/04/2000 are accepted by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.,

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed on 11/01/2000, paper no. # 2, has been considered, a copy of PTO-1449 herewith attached to this office action, paper no. # 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-7,11,17,18-24,28,are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watters, US Patent No. 5897645.

6. As to Claims 1 and 17-18, Watters teaches a system which including 'a system For translating transaction data' [see Abstract], Watters is directed to composing electronic data interchange information, more specifically converting one data format into a common format in accordance with the document map as detailed Abstract, 'a core data structure having a plurality of predefined data fields' [col 5, line 58-67], Watters specifically suggests for example data record my define the format of one or more data fields [col 5, line 60-62], therefore data fields are integral part of Watters's teaching because data record(s) may contain one or more data fields and is part of data structure, 'at least one first dictionary corresponding to at least one input data format' [col 3, line 42-44, line 56-58], first dictionary corresponds to Watters's first business data system fig 1, element 12, data format corresponds to data format in the data files of first business data system12, 'at least one second dictionary corresponding to at least one output data format' [col 3, line 46-49, line line 60-63], second dictionary corresponds to Watters's second business data system fig 1, element 14, data format corresponds to data format in the second business data system data files element 24, further it is noted that electronic data in the data files element 16, and second data format of data in data files element 24 are different or typically not compatible [col 3, line 60-63], therefore, Watters specifically suggests not only two business data systems, but also respective data format in the data files, 'a translation engine' [fig 1, element 28, col 3, line 48-50], translation engine corresponds to Watters's conversion system fig.1, element 28, 'engine receiving input transaction data in said input data format, engine using said first dictionary to locate, within said input transaction data, data corresponding to at least a

portion of the predefined data fields of said core data structure' [col 3, line col 4, line 59-64, col 5, line 36-43], predefined data fields of said core data structure is integral part of Watters's teaching because Watter specifically suggests two business entities having two different data formats that are connected though conversion system as detailed in fig 1, further data composition system to create not only mapping, but also contains a predetermined data format that will allow the data to be exchanged between first business and second business entities as detailed in col 5, line 36-43, 'engine using said second dictionary to output transaction data, in said output data format, said output transaction data corresponding to at least a portion of the predefined data fields of said core data structure' [col 5, line 36-48, col 6, line 1-12, line 24-29].

7. As to Claims 2, 19, Watters teaches a system which including input data format comprises data organized in segments' and fields' [col 5, line 60-63, col 7, line 13-18, line 47-50], Watters specifically teaches for example segments such as detailed in fig 4, element 114, segment corresponds to Watters document segments, 'first dictionary comprises data representing identification of a plurality of segments comprising a plurality of fields, the size of each said field, and an indicator of whether said field is required or optional [col 7, line 51-60, col 8, line 33-44, table 1].

8. As to Claims 3-4,6, and 20-21,23, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Watters disclosed 'mapping instructions to map a predefined data field, input data format to locate data in said input data in said

input data format corresponding to said predefined data field' [col 5, line 36-48, col 6, line 23-39,], mapping corresponds to Watters's maping data records into document map.

9. As to Claims 5 and 22, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection. In addition, Watters disclosed 'at least a parameter of field size and organization' [see table: 1-2, col 9, line 6-20], table 1 and 2 is directed to specifically electronic data interchange or EDI having various information fields such as element, description, and size or length as detailed in col 9, line 6-20.

10. As to Claims 7 and 24, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection. In addition, Watters disclosed 'default data to combine with data from said core data structure to output data in said output format when said at least one parameter of said output data format requires data which is not present ins aid core data structure' [col 10, line 5-13, line 26-36], Watters specifically suggest using ANSI EDI standard for generating the information such as detailed in table 1, further ANSI EDI standard can expand the data in table 1 to the data in the table 2 as detailed in col 9, table 2.

11. As to Claim 11 and 28, Watters teaches a system which including 'warehousing storage electronically stores data from at least a first input transaction after said transaction has been translated into said core data structure' [fig 1, col 3, line 35-40, col 7, line 24-31].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 8-10,12-16,25-27,29-33are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watters, US Patent No. 5897645 as applied to claims 1,18 above, and further in view of Bickerton et al., [hereafter Bickerton] US Patent No. 6041312.

13. As to Claims, 8 and 25, Watters teaches a system which including 'transaction data and/or said output transaction data' [col 7, line 22-31], however, Watters does not specifically teach 'audit log'. On the other hand, Bickerton teaches 'audit log' [fig 4 and fig 11, col 6, line 22-44], audit log corresponds to Bickerton's audit log as detailed in fig 11.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the teachings of Bickerton et al. into composing electronic data interchange information of Watters because they both directed to business related data communication system [see Watters: col 3, line 42-50, fig 1; Bickerton: fig 3-4, col 2, line 29-41], more specifically using electronic data interchange mechanism [see Bickerton: fig 16, col 16, line 9-15], and they are both from business related data field of endeavor. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to have combined the references because that would have allowed users of Watters's composing electronic data interface information to keep and control which relative combinations of individual audit log satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Bickerton et al. [col 2, line 50-56].

14. As to Claims 9-10,12-13,26-27, 29-30, both Watters and Bickerton teaches 'computer network, said system receiving said input transaction data from a computer via said network and sending said output transaction data to a computer via said network' [Watters: fig 1, col 3, line 42-55; Bickerton: fig 2], further Bickerton teaches 'audit log' [fig 4 and fig 11, col 6, line 22-44], audit log corresponds to Bickerton's audit log as detailed in fig 11.

15. As to Claims 14-15,31-32, both Watters and Bickerton teaches 'generating data representing a plurality of output transactions from said input transaction data, wherein said input transaction data represents a single input transaction' [Watters: col 8, line 33-39; Bickerton: col 10, line 33-45].

16. As to Claims 16 and 33, Bickerton teaches a system which including 'output transactions are sent to different computers' [col 6, line 54-59].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 8/8/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

a) At page 1, line 11-12, Claims 1-7,11,17-24,28, applicant argues Watters does not teach the use of two separate dictionaries

b) At page2, line 3-4, Watters first and second business data sysem are not analogus to the claimed first and second dictionaries...

c) At page 2, line 16-18, Watters does not teach using two separate dictionaries.....

As to above arguments (a-c), examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Watters is directed to electronic data interchange information, more specifically Watters suggests business data communications system consists of at least first business data system, and second business data system connected through data

transfer as detailed in fig 1, secondly, data records are integral part of first business and second business system, also if the format of the data records are not compatible to each other, they are translated to a common data format as detailed in col 3, line 63-66, thirdly, in the office action, examiner clearly stated that first dictionary corresponds to Watter's first business data system element 12, fig 1, further second dictionary corresponds to second business data system element 14, fig 1 that suggests Watters specifically teaches two separate dictionaries. As best understood by the examiner, normalization is the process of organizing data and breaking it into smaller groups that are easier to manage, also normalize a database or dictionary or business data system(s) is to prevent redundant or duplicate data is a common knowledge in the database art. It is also noted that Watters specifically suggested using ANSI EDI standard in the first and second business data system for processing both standard and non-standard fields [col 10, line 5-18].

Examiner applies above arguments to Claims 8-10,12-16,25-27 and 29-33 are dependent from Claim 1 and 18.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	5897645
b.	US Patent No.	6041312

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

c.	US Patent No.	6490718
e.	US Patent No.	6330563
f.	US Patent No.	6408292
g.	US Patent No.	6256676
h.	US Patent No.	5878419
i.	US Patent No.	5893076
j.	US Patent No.	5956688
k.	US Patent No.	6360223
l.	US Patent No.	6154748

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238	**(After Final Communication)**
703/746-7239	**(Offical Communications)**
703/746-7240	**(For Status inquiries, draft communication)**

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

sc
Patent Examiner.
August 13, 2003.